

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13-15 and 19-26 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13-15, 19-22, 25 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,564,548 to Dobbins *et al.* ("Dobbins") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,687,830 to Hayes *et al.* ("Hayes").

Claims 10, 11, 23 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dobbins in view of Hayes and U.S. Patent No. 6,311,820 to Hallas Bell *et al.* ("Bell").

Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13-15 and 19-26 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13-15 and 19-26 herein is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13-15, 19-22, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dobbins in view of Hayes. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons. The Examiner states that:

variable parameter Cntrl is the function of a fraud attack acceptability criterion that is created as a **result of a previously inserted fraudulent coin** is [sic] inserted into the apparatus of Dobbins.

6/14/2010 Office Action, p. 5 (emphasis added). Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion and determined in response to

the fraud attack while the fraud attack is occurring.

Claim 1 (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that neither Dobbins nor Hayes teach or otherwise suggest this feature.

Dobbins teaches a coin examining apparatus and method for setting acceptance limits for coin money. Dobbins, 1:19-25. Dobbins further teaches obtaining three independent coin signal values for each coin under test, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m and mapping those values in a three dimensional coordinate system represented by vectors, V_m and determining whether the vectors fall within acceptability regions C_m . Dobbins, 8:11-33, Figure 4. Dobbins discloses comparing the measured values of X_1, X_2, \dots, X and determining the differences between those measured values, Δ_1 to Δ_m , and the center point for each vector, $Cntr_1, \dots, Cntr_m$. Dobbins, 8: 63 -9:5, Figure 5. Dobbins further discloses:

If the coin is not accepted as valid, no adjustment to the center of the coin adjustment window (designated in FIG. 9 as CNTR) is made and the system waits for the next coin.

Dobbins, 13:39-42. Dobbins makes no adjustment in response to a fraud attack. Dobbins does not teach or otherwise suggest, "at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion and determined in response to the fraud attack while the fraud attack is occurring." Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Nor does Hayes teach this feature. Hayes discloses a system in which time varying deviations in the circuits are compensated. There is no teaching or suggestion in Hayes of "at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion and determined in response to the fraud attack while the fraud attack is occurring." Claim 1 (emphasis added).

For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and

Claims 2, 6-11, and 13 that depend from claim 1 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dobbins in view of Hayes.

Claim 14 has been amended and discloses substantially similar features as claim 1:

at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion and determined in response to the fraud attack while the fraud attack is occurring.

Claim 14 (emphasis added). Because the combination of Dobbins in view of Hayes does not teach or otherwise suggest these features of claim 14 for the reasons discussed above in regard to claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 and claims 15, and 19-26 that depend from claim 14 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dobbins in view of Hayes.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dobbins in view of Hayes and Bell. Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1. As explained above, neither Dobbins nor Hayes teach or otherwise suggest the feature of "at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion and determined in response to the fraud attack while the fraud attack is occurring." Claim 1 (emphasis added). Nor does Bell.

Bell describes a coin validator that is calibrated by inserting a calibration key to produce a calibration value of signals as a function of the individual characteristics of the validator. Bell, abstract. There is no teaching or suggestion in Bell of "at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion and determined in response to the fraud attack while the fraud attack is occurring." Claim 1 (emphasis added). For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and Claims 2, 6-11, and 13 that

depend from claim 1 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dobbins in view of Hayes and Bell.

The Examiner has rejected claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dobbins in view of Hayes and Bell. As explained above, neither Dobbins nor Hayes teach or otherwise suggest the feature of "at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion and determined in response to the fraud attack while the fraud attack is occurring." Claim 14 (emphasis added). Nor does Bell.

Bell describes a coin validator that is calibrated by inserting a calibration key to produce a calibration value of signals as a function of the individual characteristics of the validator. Bell, abstract. There is no teaching or suggestion in Bell of "at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion and determined in response to the fraud attack while the fraud attack is occurring." Claim 14 (emphasis added). For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 14 and Claims 15, and 19-26 that depend from claim 14 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Dobbins in view of Hayes and Bell.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending (1) are in proper form, (2) are neither obvious nor anticipated by the relied upon art of record, and (3) are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the

Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (650) 614-7660. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 15-0665.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 14, 2010

By: Sanjeet K. Dutta
Sanjeet K. Dutta
Reg. No. 46,145

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, CA 92614-2558
Telephone: 650 614-7660
Facsimile: 650 614-7401
Customer Number: 34313